

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT POLICY REVIEW TASK FORCE

MEETING ONE - NOTES & SUMMARY

10:00am-4:00pm, September 27, 2005
Augusta Elks Lodge, Augusta, Maine

Task Force Members Present: Lee Liner; Mark Draper; Troy Moon (for Mike Bobinsky); Steve Dyer; Stefan Pakulski; Jerry Hughes; Jeff Austin; Chris Hall; Joseph Kazar; Peter Prata; Kevin Roche; Don Meagher; Jeff McGown; John Adelman; Ron Smalley; Gloria Fredrick; Paul Therrien; Peggy Daigle; Sarah Wojcoski; Susan Lessard; Greg Lounder; Fergus Lea; Victor Horton; Laura Sanborn; William Lippincott; Will Everitt; Don Gallagher; Paula Clark; Sue Inches; Sam Morris; George MacDonald

Members of the Public Present: David Littell; George Criner; Mark St. Germain; Juliet Browne; Cathy Lee; Jody Harris

Facilitators: Jeff Edelstein, Ona Ferguson.

Others in Attendance: Aimee Dolloff

I. OVERVIEW OF TASK FORCE AND SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Welcome

Sue Inches, Deputy Director of the Maine State Planning Office (SPO) welcomed the group on behalf of the SPO and thanked everyone for their willingness to participate in the preparatory assessment and in the task force's meetings.

Sue explained that the goals of the task force are to gather information and identify important and critical issues. She explained that the group at the table represents a diverse set of interests and the purpose of the task force is to elicit and understand the diversity of opinions on Maine's solid waste policies. That information will inform the written recommendations that the SPO will provide publicly to the Natural Resources Committee of the Maine Legislature. Sue stated that the SPO is hoping the task force will identify issues that are most critical, and that the tremendous knowledge in the room will enable the SPO to see "the whole picture," to understand the various impacts that state solid waste policy has on the ground, and to identify additional data needs.

Task Force Overview

Jeff Edelstein described the background and planned task force process. The goals of the task force are to hear a diversity of perspectives in order to: (a) identify key issues; (b) identify perceived problems; (c) understand impacts; (d) suggest policy changes and assess the impacts of those changes; and (e) identify additional information needed.

In July and August of 2005, Jeff conducted an assessment on 30 confidential interviews with individuals and organizations, identified by SPO, who were involved with solid waste management. The assessment identified nine areas to be the primary focus of this task force, and was intended to help the task force make the best use of its time by enabling the group to narrow in quickly on those issues of greatest importance to the group. These are:

- (1) the solid waste hierarchy;

- (2) disposal capacity;
- (3) the roles of state, municipal and commercial sectors;
- (4) local communities;
- (5) construction and demolition debris;
- (6) material bans;
- (7) recycling;
- (8) regional approaches; and
- (9) public education.

These nine areas, which were identified as the primary areas of concern to those interviewed, will shape the agendas of the task force meetings. The goal for this first meeting is to discuss Maine's solid waste hierarchy; the top priority of those interviewed. Three task force meetings are scheduled. Task force meetings are open to the public, and will include time for public comment. In addition, SPO will consult with the Legislature's Natural Resources Committee during the task force process.

Participants were then invited to introduce themselves, and to say (a) what they would like to see come out of the process and (b) what they bring to the process. The answers to these questions can be found in Appendices A and B, respectively. Over the course of the day, participants requested additional information and data, which are listed in Appendix C.

Solid Waste Presentation

George MacDonald of the SPO gave an overview of the status of solid waste management in Maine, including other current related task forces and bills in the legislature. There is currently one solid waste management related task force, which is investigating the feasibility of a buy-out and eventual closure of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy facility in Biddeford. It has had three meetings to date, all well attended.

Three bills related to solid waste were held over from the last legislative session:

- **LD141** –to ban landfilling or incineration of construction and demolition debris originating from structures from out of state.
- **LD 1669** – to authorize a timeline and certain host community benefits for city of Old Town
- **LD 1578** – to ensure protection and benefits to communities hosting waste-to-energy facilities

Task force members asked the following questions:¹

- *Was bill 880 killed, which would have limited the landfilling of bypass waste and would have required the adoption of rules to ensure that landfilling is not the primary means of disposal of municipal solid waste?* The bill was killed.
- *What happened to the tire tax fee bill?* It was passed as a resolve requiring DEP to report back by January of 2007 on alternative sources of revenue that could be implemented to replace the \$1/tire fee. The report is to include an evaluation of possible alternative funding mechanisms, including new or revised fees on solid wastes (inc. special wastes), consumer products sold, and solid waste facilities and licenses, as well as recommendations concerning funding mechanisms.
- *Should there be a placeholder for bills from this task force?* SPO has submitted a placeholder bill, should legislation be an avenue for any of its recommendations.

The current Maine solid waste policies were, for the most part, adopted in 1989. We now have four waste-to-energy facilities in operation. Since that time, new commercial disposal facilities have been banned. At that

¹ In this and other bulleted lists of questions and responses, 'italicized' indicates comment made by task force member and 'plain text' comments were SPO responses unless noted otherwise.

time, the goal of 50% recycling was set, though recycling programs were only available to approximately 16% of the population. Much of the infrastructure in place today was in place then with the exception of recycling infrastructure. Since then, the state has closed town dumps to have communities provide programs with less environmental impacts and to reduce the number of sites for managing waste generated in the state of Maine.

Today there are approximately 250 transfer stations in Maine, and most communities work in cooperation with other communities to dispose of waste. Some communities send waste out-of-state or country, but most use disposal facilities in-state. George displayed a map showing where municipal waste in Maine was disposed of in 2003, which is the most recent data available.

In 2003, 2,020,000 tons of waste were generated in Maine, of which 157,000 tons of waste were exported (to other states or Canada) for disposal. Also, 447,000 tons of waste were imported for disposal in Maine, most of which originated in other New England states.

In 1989, few communities had recycling programs. Now almost all communities do. Nearly half of Maine communities work with at least one other municipality to offer recycling programs, and the State-wide recycling rate in Maine is 35%. The state goal is to recycle 50% of waste, and to reduce solid waste by 5% biennially. The SPO recognizes that some of the difficulty in attaining these goals results from the fact that these goals are State goals and not municipal goals. The 50% level was chosen 16 years ago, and the state is still working towards that. In the past few years, the SPO has been working to reduce the toxicity of waste streams in Maine, in conjunction with efforts by the Department of Environmental Protection, created by the banning the disposal of certain items.

Municipalities are responsible for providing solid waste disposal. The state ban on new commercial disposal facilities remains in place, which means that the state or municipalities (or regional public entities) are the only possible owners of new disposal facilities in Maine.

The task force had some questions and comments:

- *Where did the solid waste hierarchy come from? Was establishing hierarchies a national trend? What was its purpose?* In the mid-1980s, people nationwide got very concerned with managing solid waste. Within the New England states, there were parallel efforts on how to deal with different waste streams with similar, although not identical, development of hierarchies in the various states. Maine was one of the states that put composting as a separate item in its hierarchy, while other states considered that part of recycling. Recycling has gone on extensively since WWII. In Maine, we were reaching landfill capacity in the 1980s, which led to interest in reducing the volume of materials going to landfill through incineration (which also had the benefit of energy recovery) and increased recycling. Another task force member noted that DEP put tremendous pressure on municipalities to close landfills, which also drove the pressure for solutions such as incineration and increased recycling.
- *A task force member noted that in the 1980's there was a desire to have siting decisions made by the state and the public sector rather than by commercial landfills. As it turns out, it was just as hard for the state to get buy-in from local communities regarding siting of landfills as it had been for commercial entities, so siting has been difficult no matter what type of organization was doing it.* In the 1980s, this discussion of landfilling and incineration rose to a level where it became a policy issue in Maine. In response, a state agency, the Maine Waste Management Agency, was created to handle facility siting, in addition to providing planning for waste management needs and encouraging implementation of the hierarchy. Fiscal pressures in the mid 1990s led to that department being disbanded and most of its functions were placed within the SPO.

II. THE SOLID WASTE HIERARCHY

A discussion of the solid waste hierarchy occupied the rest of the task force meeting. To establish the context for the discussion, SPO and DEP explained how the hierarchy is used by their respective agencies.

SPO and DEP Application of the Hierarchy

George MacDonald stated that the hierarchy serves as a roadmap for how SPO works with communities and businesses across the state. It guide's the SPO's focus on the 3Rs (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle) in technical and financial assistance to municipalities, as well as in outreach and education. It helps determine what types of projects SPO will give money for. Recently, the SPO has been providing assistance to municipalities for reducing landfill volume and waste toxicity, and building facilities to help manage mercury-containing products and universal waste such as cathode-ray tubes (CRTs). Through regional efforts, such as the Northeast Recycling Council, SPO is promoting waste reduction with business and industry. In terms of reuse, SPO is helping communities construct facilities such as swap shops that help facilitate reuse. The State has provided communities with over \$12M in grant monies over the past 13 years to increase recycling rates by assisting public programs with infrastructure, equipment, and buildings. Current law requires that businesses with 15 or more employees at a location to recycle corrugated cardboard and office paper. Composting is one of the last frontiers to be implemented large-scale, and the recently started Sandy River Recycling Association/Town of Farmington's mode of food waste recycling for institutional food discards may become the model from which other municipalities can learn.

Paula Clark of DEP stated that there is no prescribed way DEP must follow the hierarchy in managing solid waste programs in Maine, though DEP considers it in several ways. It informs how DEP makes program choices and priority setting. Examples of program emphasis in response to the hierarchy include the Beneficial Reuse Task Force, (which looked specifically at beneficial reuse and how the state might facilitate such reuse), the agronomic reuse program (which accounts for the highest volume of reuse in the state), electronic waste management, reduction of mercury-containing products, and product stewardship issues. Maine has also led in composting, including fish and seafood and animal carcass composting.

Review of the Hierarchy section of the Assessment Report:

The group reviewed the "Interviewee Comments" section of the Assessment Report and provided the following comments, revisions, and additions:

- Re: bullet 1:
 - The statement that energy prices were higher when the hierarchy developed may not be the case
 - Volume reduction coming into facilities isn't decreased; rather what is happening inside the facilities is decreasing waste volume.
- The development of the hierarchy in the 1980's is "ancient history" in the solid waste industry, which has changed significantly since then.
- The incinerator life cycle estimates may not be accurate. All plants estimate a life expectancy of 20-25 years from now at a minimum. Estimates from waste-to-energy facility representatives were: MMWAC: 20-50 years, PERC: indefinite due to capital improvements, ME: indefinite due to capital improvements, RWS: indefinite due to capital improvements, noting that an independent audit estimated 2030 for equipment and that financing will be done in 2014
- Add: the trend of landfills taking in much more waste than they did in 1988.
- Add: there was never a consideration that there wouldn't be landfills in Maine
- Add: economic considerations need to be included.

- Add: all items on the hierarchy should be recognized as necessary components of solid waste systems. It should be seen as more of a system, as it is in other states. Occasionally people have falsely interpreted the hierarchy to mean that you shouldn't fund or support those items low on the hierarchy. They may see having landfills as failure, when in fact it is a necessary part of a system.
- The hierarchy does have an impact, and shouldn't be seen as sacred or fixed.
- I don't think the legislative committee expects the task force to propose changes to the hierarchy.
- Add: economic influences and the market have an effect on how the hierarchy is used and to what extent it is or is not effective.
- Add: the hierarchy does not exist in a vacuum. It influences the other topics of the task force and vice versa.
- Add: we think that discouraging disposal will increase recycling, but that isn't so.
- We should be thinking about "resource" management, not "waste" management; this is a broader more integrated view.

Predominant Themes

Within the discussions about the hierarchy, the following were recurring themes:

Purpose, Application and Impact: The hierarchy makes sense if its purpose is to minimize disposal of solid waste. The 3Rs are good. When something is disposed of on the land, it means we have wasted it by not capturing more value from it and also wasted the land it is stored on. Some participants wanted to know the volume reduction in incinerators. Those representing waste-to-energy facilities agreed that their facilities achieved approximately 80-90% volume reduction, which was noted by many as a significant success for the hierarchy.

Many people stated that the concern about the hierarchy isn't debate over its structure but rather over how the hierarchy is applied and how the pieces work together. Some noted a desire for more guidance on why the hierarchy exists and how it is to be used. Others noted a lack of integration among the pieces of the hierarchy, and stated that if options low on the hierarchy are being used, it should be after first having explored the possibilities of using the top strategies (the 3Rs). They noted that the fact that Maine is opening new landfills while not reaching state recycling goals suggests that something isn't working.

There was a range of opinions regarding the impact of the hierarchy. One participant stated that application of the hierarchy has been important, and that changing the hierarchy now could confuse the public. The question was posed about how things would be different if there were no hierarchy. DEP stated that if the hierarchy didn't exist, it would not change their program choices because the priorities in the hierarchy make good environmental sense. SPO stated that the absence of the hierarchy would leave them without consistent integrated goals. Several participants noted their appreciation to the SPO staff and their work that supports municipal activities. Municipal participants said they would continue to pursue recycling because it makes economic sense. A common theme expressed was that individuals and businesses make their decisions based more on economics and ease than on the hierarchy itself. One participant expressed that without the hierarchy, there would now be lots more landfills. Lastly, a participant stated that there is no objective way to measure the effectiveness of the hierarchy, and that the SPO Capacity Report, which shows waste increasing in Maine provides one answer to the question of effectiveness.

3Rs/Incineration-Landfill Split: One participant asked whether perhaps peoples' concerns regarding the hierarchy are primarily about the rank ordering of incineration or landfilling, not a concern about any of the top items on the hierarchy. There seemed to be general agreement that the 3Rs should remain as the highest priorities, and everyone wants to see performance rates for the 3Rs increase. Other participants responded that level of concern on which item is ranked where depends on how the hierarchy is used, and that if it is applied more consistently, people might care more about the order of the top three as well.

Economics: To bring recycling rates to the 50% goal, there have to be both regulations and incentives for municipalities to grow their recycling programs. Businesses are often more on-board than homeowners on recycling, so more economic incentives to encourage this desired behavior would be beneficial. Because we can see that waste isn't all flowing where we'd like it to, resources need to be devoted differently to make improvements. The prioritization of the 3Rs in the hierarchy isn't nearly as significant as bottom line costs. When we look at what is working, we see that the answer is dependent on cost. If it costs more to recycle than not to, people and municipalities and businesses will choose not to recycle. When the cost of recycling decreases, people are happy to recycle.

Group assessment and analysis of the hierarchy

The bulk of work on the hierarchy occurred in the form of group brainstorming and group evaluation of ideas listed on flip charts in front of the task force by the facilitators. The notes captured on the flip charts are recreated here.

WHAT IS WORKING WITH THE HIERARCHY?

- The waste to energy facilities have decreased waste volume going into landfills.
- Expectations and public understanding.
- Solid waste reduction is much better than in 1988 before the hierarchy.
- Businesses have incentives.
- The program is working, all the necessary elements are in place
- It decreases disposal quantities. Without the hierarchy the landscape would be dotted with landfills.
- It has economic incentives for the lower items on the hierarchy to drive action
- The Bottle Bill is the best in the nation. We could apply that model to other materials in the waste stream.
- Pay-as-you-throw systems seem to be reducing disposal streams in communities in Maine that have implemented them. 130 communities in Maine have these, where you have to pay to throw away waste but not to recycle. This both decreases the waste stream and generates some revenue. Bowdoinham was noted as a municipality where waste volume was reduced from five to three tons per week and recycling rates increased substantially in response to the implementation of a pay-as-you-throw program.

WHAT ISN'T WORKING WITH THE HIERARCHY?

The group identified the areas in which they felt the hierarchy is not working, which were listed on flip charts. After all ideas had been expressed, each participant was given five sticky dots by which to indicate the areas they felt were most important on this list, in order to get a sense of which issues to focus the remaining afternoon discussion on. The numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of priority dots participants placed by each item.

1. There is no common understanding of how the hierarchy is applied (19)
2. There are too few financial resources applied to the task of applying the hierarchy and not enough matching funds for municipal programs (11)
3. No economic incentives for 3Rs (9)
4. Costs are divorced from the hierarchy (9)
5. Homeowners and municipalities need incentives or rules (9)
6. It doesn't address out-of-state waste (9)
7. 3Rs are not applied enough prior to using processes lower on the hierarchy (7)
8. How it is communicated (6)

9. The need to re-educate every generation of the public (5)
10. It doesn't address packaging or purchasing behavior (4)
11. Not being applied on the ground (especially 3Rs) (3)
12. Not applied cohesively (3)
13. The town threshold levels for incineration take priority over the hierarchy and work against efforts to increase the 3Rs (3)
14. It only considers solid waste (not amount of air pollution generated) (3)
15. Not being applied cohesively (3)
16. Need to change business and individual habits (2)
17. Its usefulness depends on the material being considered (1)
18. If Maine is opening new landfills and not meeting the 50% recycling goal, something isn't working (1)
19. Counting and comparing needs to be on a level playing field (i.e. compare the same type of materials when looking at recycling numbers across states or other entities) (1)
20. The 3Rs policy has little impact (1)
21. There is no objective way to assess outcomes of state policies and programs, and no evaluation of bond expenditures (0)
22. The hierarchical (vs. system) approach leads to unrealistic expectations such as having no landfills (0)
23. The 3Rs depend on citizen action, not municipal control (0)

After the task force members indicated the most important items (above), the facilitators did a preliminary grouping of items by common themes and identified the top 5 issues, which were then discussed in more detail by the task force. Participants were asked to identify the impacts resulting from these problems and to propose possible solutions. Their comments are noted in the table on the following two pages. Following this discussion, the participants brainstormed additional general solutions, which have been included in the table below. The prioritization tallies are shown in parentheses.

ISSUE	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<p>1. Application of the hierarchy: There is no common understanding of how the hierarchy is applied (19). 3Rs are not applied enough prior to using processes lower on the hierarchy (7). Hierarchy isn't being applied cohesively (3). Not being applied on the ground (esp. 3Rs) (3). Its usefulness depends on the material being considered (1). Solid waste management too complicated to fit into simple hierarchy (from morning discussion).</p> <p>Total: 33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty for applicants and for regulatory agencies that are not state agencies but have to deal with the hierarchy • Can create the impression that items are mutually exclusive or in competition, which can lead to disputes during the regulatory process that facilities low on the list shouldn't be permitted (when they all need to exist). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate whether the hierarchy is guidance or a rule, i.e. is it required? • Expand hierarchy language so that it becomes a guidance purpose statement. • Create specific regulations to accompany the hierarchy. • Be clear in the statute <i>how</i> the hierarchy should be used. • Define/articulate that all items on the hierarchy are necessary and that each item has its own function and purpose (integrated system). • Hierarchy should be expanded to include education, universal waste, and the bottle bill. • Anticipate waste stream changes coming in the next decade and design policy to address anticipated needs in advance. • Leave the hierarchy as is.
<p>2. Economics and other drivers: Costs are divorced from the hierarchy (9). There are no economic incentives for the 3Rs (9). The town threshold levels for incineration take priority over the hierarchy (3).</p> <p>Total: 21</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of pollution is passed on to the public if it isn't front-loaded • Decision-making is disconnected from economics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replicate and/or expand successful models, such as producer take-back and stewardship of products (like are currently in place for tires, car batteries, etc.) and bottle bill. • Do a cost-benefit analysis that broadly considers present and future costs when applying the hierarchy. One-size fits all application of the hierarchy may not be a good idea. • Develop policy to tie economics with the hierarchy to help shape how people make decisions. • Reduce the toxicity of waste going to landfills and waste-to-energy plants in order to encourage economic investments. • Pay-per-bag changes behavior. • Remove the disincentives for doing the 3Rs such as waste supply thresholds (it was stated that towns could recycle themselves into a corner if they produce too little waste for their disposal facility).
<p>3. Financial resources and program support: There are too few financial resources applied to the task of applying the hierarchy/promoting the 3Rs and not enough matching funds for municipal programs (11).</p> <p>Total: 11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a decrease in interest in environmental programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more state matching funds for municipalities. • Earmark money for cleaning up the waste stream. • Determine the appropriate level of staffing, provide the requisite funding, and increase state-level staffing to that level. • Increase public awareness and remind the public that the 3Rs are important, which can then lead to the public advocating for more funding support of the 3Rs. • Use unclaimed bottle deposit funds. • Develop a toolkit for municipalities of things they can do to reduce waste, especially in rural areas. • Look more to the private sector approach (combine Issues 2 and 3).

ISSUE	IMPACTS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
4. Changing public's actions: Homeowners and municipalities need incentives or rules (9). Need to change business and individual habits (2). Total: 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State could impose pay-as-you-throw state-wide. Start with education and incentives before imposing any more regulations (though pay-as-you-throw statewide may be ok). Let the State handle disposal of toxic materials it diverts from municipal solid waste streams. This would promote regionalism and efficiency.
5. Communications and Education: How it is communicated (6). The need to re-educate every generation of the public (5). Total: 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed as specific issue. Increase funds available for education programs about waste disposal options (from discussion of general solutions).
6. Out-of-state waste: The hierarchy doesn't address out-of-state waste (9). Total: 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfill capacity is scarce Trucking, road conditions, and odors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only approve state-owned landfills. Define what qualifies as out-of-state waste. Collaborate regionally with the other New England states on waste policy. Charge a fee on all waste brought into ME, and distribute that among the municipalities (that also have to pay a fee for their waste) which will lead to a higher tipping fee and will decrease the attractiveness of bringing waste in from out of state.
7. Broader scope: It doesn't address packaging or purchasing behavior (4). It doesn't consider air pollution impacts (3). Total: 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not discussed.
8. Organizational (from discussion of general solutions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement the 5-year solid waste management plan. Create an ongoing working or advisory group on solid waste. Assess grants results of state money given to municipalities in the past decade, establishing benchmarks of success. Recreate a separate state agency totally devoted to waste management, since only six people in the SPO currently provide these services to the entire state. Ensure that when comparing recycling rates across states, comparisons are appropriate (compare systems incorporating the same types of waste).

Appendix A

Question asked of those in attendance - What do you contribute to this process?

- Not making assumptions
- Boldness
- Open mind
- Listening (several said this)
- Ability to see the big picture
- Viewpoint
- Boil issue down to its kernel
- Ask tough questions
- Share a broad perspective
- Real world experience (many said this)
- Finding consensus
- Experience (many said this): with the first state-owned landfill, doing public education, living with a landfill (several said this)
- Ideas from the private sector
- Knowledge of recycling markets (several said this)
- Regional approach perspective (several said this)
- What worked and didn't in other states
- Legislative experience
- Negative energy
- A positive attitude
- A Municipal perspective (several said this)
- A balance between different interests
- A commitment to explore
- Knowledge of "on-the-ground" management
- A shift from negative to positive
- Fairness (several said this)
- A perspective between municipal and state
- A customer's perspective

Appendix B

Question asked of those in attendance - What would you like to see from this process?

- Bold ideas
- Open minds
- Illumination (several people said this)
- Certainty
- Issue identification, issue prioritization
- Sharing perspectives in a non-dispute setting, a fair reading of a range of sector perspectives, a deliberate process – don't draw quick conclusions
- Fair rules and equilibrium on solid waste
- Re-emphasis of hierarchy considering new concerns and technologies (several people said this)
- Public awareness and education (several people said this)
- A collaborative effort on smart waste policy
- Can Maine do something unique and aggressive on solid waste policy?
- Clarification on current rules and whether or not they need any changes, does the state have a coherent solid waste decrease policy, and what is it?
- Host agreements – better protections for communities and responsiveness to local communities (several people said this)
- Reconsideration of definitions of types of waste
- Better position the state financially to be able to manage its policies and enforcement so as to protect host and state communities
- Decision making process and impacts for Maine residents and beyond
- Continuation of state policy in the public and municipal interests
- A shared vision of more recycling and a decrease in waste, a strong recycling program that will be enforced (on industry too) (several people said this)
- How does recycling fit in the hierarchy, and what is the public and private sector commitment to recycling?
- Getting goals of decreasing waste of more than 50% (several people said this)
- Establish a long-term vision for the state
- Policy goals for the public/private sectors to work together to manage resources
- A summary of barriers and incentives in policy
- A discussion of political needs to getting from here to a better policy – how do we get political support for the current policy?
- Look at solid waste as a resource (have a positive perspective)
- Develop framework for treating participant interests fairly
- Improved policy guidance and something that the legislature can support
- Cost effective, reliable infrastructure for solid waste, within which all options can be considered
- A change in state statutes, as right now municipal solid waste is considered “trash”
- Ensure the framework is applied fairly
- Don't assume there won't be changes to the hierarchy

Appendix C

Request for additional Data and Information Needs

- A 2-3 page narrative history write up on where the hierarchy came from, based on the written history on the 1989 legislation, to which can be added task force participant knowledge.
- Identification of successful programs that have increased recycling within communities in Maine and in other states (what are others doing?)
- A better understanding of the data on which Maine's recycling numbers are based
- Information on where Maine ranks nationwide in recycling rates
- A summary of SPO's five-year plan (which is available on SPO's website)
- Results of grants provided by the state to municipalities for recycling programs
- An overview of 'Pay As You Throw' programs and impacts on recycling
- Maps shown by George MacDonald that should be posted on the SPO website.
- Extent and impact of mercury in the waste stream.